



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

O.

He despises all the glory of the world in comparison with the divine law, counting all things as but dung compared with Christ's table: nor is he disturbed by the violence of the thunder of this world; but rejoices in tribulation when he suffers for Christ.—Phil. iii. 8; Acts v. 41.

P.

A good and faithful shepherd of the Gospel-flock, chosen by God, to watch the people of God, and to feed, with Divine doctrines, the nation, for which, after the example of Christ, he is giving his life.—John x. 14; John xxi. 15; John xv. 13.

Q.

Whom the Saviour advanced for his merits to be a bishop, that he might exhort the clergy in the heavenly warfare, to whom he distributes the bread from heaven, along with garments, which is fulfilled in his Divine and holy discourses.—1 Tim. i. 18; John vi. 11; Matt. xxiii. 11.

R.

A messenger of the king inviting believers to the marriage, who is arrayed in the wedding garment; who draws the heavenly wine in heavenly vessels, pledging the people of God in the spiritual cup.—Matt. xxii. 2.

S.

He finds in the Sacred Volume a sacred treasure, which he purchases with his holy and perfect merits; he discerns also the Godhead of the Saviour in the flesh, whence he is named Israel, beholding God in his spirit.—Matt. xiii. 44; Gen. xxxii. 28, 30.

T.

A faithful witness of God in the Catholic doctrine, whose words are seasoned with the divine oracles, so that they are not corrupted like human flesh, and eaten of worms, but are salted with a heavenly savour for the sacrifice.—Mark ix. 48-50; Col. iv. 6.

V.

A true and excellent cultivator of the Gospel field, whose seeds are seen to be the gospels of Christ, which he sows from his divine mouth into the ears of the wise, and tills their hearts and minds with the holy Spirit.—Matt. xiii; Mark iv. 14.

X.

Christ chose him to be his vicar on the earth, who liberates captives from a two-fold bondage; and of the many whom he has redeemed from the bondage of men, releases numberless persons from the dominion of the devil.—Is. lxi. 1; John viii. 31.

Y.

He sings Hymns with the Apocalypse, and the Psalms of God, on which also he discourses for the edification of the people of God: which Scripture he believes in the Trinity of the sacred name, and teaches the one substance in three persons.—Rom. xv. 4.

Z.

Girt with the girdle of the Lord, by day and night, he prays without ceasing to the Lord God, receiving the reward of which great labour, he shall reign with the holy Apostles over Israel.—Is. xi. 5; Eph. vi. 14; 1 Thess. v. 17; Matt. xix. 28.

RESULTS OF INTOLERANCE IN SPAIN.

THERE is one principle of the Romish Church in which the boasted immutability of her doctrine and teaching must be admitted by all readers of history, and that is, the principle of intolerance. The same spirit which, at the present day, excludes all whom she is pleased to call heretics from the rights of Christian sepulture and prohibits the erection of a place of worship—which, in Tuscany, consigns to prisons those who dare attempt to dispute her infallibility—and which, even in our own land, calls it an insult to be invited to a discussion of her doctrines—has also pervaded her rulers at all former periods of her history, and there is hardly a country in Europe which does not afford examples of the practical application of her intolerance when possessed of the power.

In making this charge particularly against the Romish Church, it is necessary to call our readers' attention to a distinction between the intolerance of the Romish Church and that of all other religions. We believe there is no nation which has not, at some period of its existence, made a difference in political privileges between those conforming to the religion established and recognised by the state and those dissenting from it. The Greek Church in Russia—the Mahometans in Turkey—our own government in former years—all adopted this course. But the Romish Church stands alone in claiming a right to extirpate altogether those who dissent from her doctrines. And there is not a country in Europe which does not afford melancholy examples of the crimes and folly which the

enforcing of her principles has led rulers to be guilty of. Nor is it an unnecessary task to recall the attention of our readers to these transactions of former years; for though we altogether deem it an invidious and false argument to impeach any religion because of the crimes of its professors in bygone years, yet, when we find the same principles actuating those who hold that religion at the present day, and enforced with the same rigour wherever they possess the power; and when we also find the exercise of that power justified by their own organs, we surely may fairly recall to mind the evils which ensued from the enforcement of their principles in past times, and may call upon Roman Catholics to ask themselves can that Church, whose principles have led to such results, be that safe and infallible guide which her priesthood would wish us to believe her to be?

Our first historical reference shall be to Spain, ever foremost in the display of bigotry and intolerance.

At the present day Spain is without industry and without commerce, dependant on foreigners for the supply of almost every production that can add comfort to existence; her finances are dilapidated, and her credit gone. Can we wonder when we find in her past history that her rulers, at the dictation of an intolerant priesthood, banished from her soil or drove into separation all those of her subjects who were most distinguished for industry and enterprise?

In the 15th century the Jews, from their wealth, their devotion to literature and science, their industry and skill, formed a most important element in the prosperity of the Spanish monarchy. In number they exceeded 160,000, and even the mass of their common people possessed a dexterity in various branches of industry which raised them far above similar classes in most other nations. But all this would not save them. In 1492 the royal confessor, Torquemada, at length extorted from the reluctant hand of Isabella the fatal decree which banished the whole body of the Jews from their homes, and stripped them of all their property. Well might the barbarian prince who saw Ferdinand and Isabella, at the bidding of a priest, sacrifice the most important and permanent interests of Spain, dispeopling it of a class of citizens who contributed beyond all others, not only to the general resources, but also to the direct revenues of the crown, exclaim—"Do they call this Ferdinand a politic prince, who can thus impoverish his own kingdom and enrich others?"

Soon was this precedent of intolerance, set by the greatest of the Spanish rulers, followed by their successors. Actuated by the same devoted zeal, and unrestrained by any feeling of compassion, Philip II. resolved that no heretic should dwell in peace within the wide circuit of his dominions. In a distant province of his vast empire, amid the swamps through which the Rhine discharges its waters into the ocean, an energetic and industrious race dwelt happy and contented on the lands recovered and preserved by their unremitting industry from the dominion of the sea. By that industry, and by the pursuits of commerce, they had added largely to the revenue and naval power of the Spanish monarchy. But they were heretics. The same independence and energy of purpose that had converted their swamps into pleasant pastures and trim gardens, had also emancipated their minds from the thralldom of Rome. Philip, in the blindness of his devotion to Rome, sent the merciless Alva to convert them from their heresy. We need not repeat here the well-known story of the cruelties of Alva, the revolt of the United Provinces, their long struggle, and their ultimate success. But we may recall to the recollection of our readers that Holland, once an obscure province of the Spanish monarchy, at the close of another century became the foremost naval power of Europe; and, though long since she yielded the supremacy of the seas to Great Britain, still, in industry, in commerce, in all that can elevate a nation, she affords a striking contrast to that Spain of which she was once an inconsiderable province.

Scarcely had the struggle with her revolted province terminated, when the successor of Philip II. meditated, and ultimately carried into execution a measure at which even the zeal and intolerance of that stern monarch was staggered. But the history of the final expulsion of the Moors, in 1609, is too full of interest to be treated cursorily.

On the Eastern side of Spain, in the sunny plains and through the valleys of Murcia and Valencia, there dwelt a numerous, a happy, and a contented people. Long subject to the kingdom of Arragon (for their conquest had been completed nearly 100 years before the union of the crowns of Arragon and Castile), they had ever been treated with kindness and consideration by their conquerors. The nobles of Arragon, on whose lands they lived, were too well aware of the value of a thriving and industrious population not to be desirous to protect them from violence and oppression; and as long as the Cortes of Arragon retained its independence, the Moors followed the pursuits of industry in security, and were, in the words of their bitter enemy—"an industrious and laborious people, and withal very frugal and temperate."

Indeed, so jealous were the Cortes of the grasping ambition of the priesthood, and of their desire to extirpate the Moors, that they passed a law by which all disturbance of the Moors was prohibited, and also made it part of their king's coronation oath—"That he should, upon no pretence whatsoever, expel the Moors, nor force them against their will to be baptized; and that he should neither directly nor indirectly ever desire to be dispensed with as to that oath, or, in case of a dispensation, should not accept it."

At length the Cortes fell, and all power passed into the hands of the crown. Charles, indeed, had taken the oath not to disturb the Moors or accept a dispensation from the obligation of that oath; but that proved a weak and ineffectual obstacle. In 1524 a formal dispensation was sent by Pope Clement VII. releasing Charles from the obligation of his oath. The terms of that document are too important to be omitted.* After a preface of some length, it proceeds thus:—

"And we do further release your Majesty from the obligation of the oath which we are informed was taken by you in the General Estates of the kingdom, absolving you from all censures and penalties of the guilt of perjury which you might incur thereby. And we do further grant free and full power to the Inquisitors to compel all that shall contradict the same, or prove refractory, by ecclesiastical censures and other proper and lawful methods, requiring the assistance of the secular arm, if it shall be judged necessary: all ordinances, statutes, and privileges of the said kingdom to the contrary notwithstanding, though confirmed by an oath, and notwithstanding it should be provided that a release from the said oath should not be desired, nor ever be made use of if granted. And in case the Moors do persist, in the hardness of their hearts, so as not to embrace the faith of Christ within a term prefixed by the Inquisitors, they shall be commanded, upon pain of perpetual servitude and bondage, to depart out of the said kingdom; which if they do fail to do within the time, they shall be all slaves, and treated as such."

This dispensation and decree of the Papal See was not given effect to in the full measure of its atrocity at that time. The terrors of the Inquisition were first tried. As that tribunal, however, professed to exercise its jurisdiction only over those who had once been baptized, and subsequently relapsed into their former opinions, the Emperor Charles V., by an ordinance issued immediately after the receipt of the dispensation, commanded all the Moors to be baptized, and threatened expulsion on their refusal. Against this ordinance the nobles of Arragon energetically protested, but without effect; and ultimately the Moors of Valencia were forced, at the point of the sword, to profess outward conformity, and receive the rite of baptism. Thenceforth the Inquisition never wanted an annual supply of relapsed Moors to grace their *autos da fe*.

But still the great purpose was uneffected. The Moors, in the midst of persecutions, still increased in numbers, and, in 1609, were estimated to amount to 600,000 souls. At length the time arrived when full and complete effect was to be given to the Pope's decree. At length the Spanish priesthood, headed by the Archbishop of Valencia and the Cardinal Archbishop of Toledo, extorted from the weak and superstitious mind of Philip III. the fatal decree which drove out of Spain upwards of half a million of her most industrious and thriving population. The arguments and inducements held out by his clerical advisers must not be passed over in silence.

The Archbishop of Valencia, under whose jurisdiction the great body of the Moors were placed, in one of his memorials, addressed to Philip, after noticing the destruction of the Amalekites by Saul, and of the Philistines by David, thus proceeds:—

"From which examples it is manifest that your Majesty, as king, is bound in conscience to defend and preserve your kingdom, which you cannot do if you do not banish the Moors—men, women and children; out of them only the children, male and female, under seven years of age, may be dispersed among the old Christians. And it is the opinion of learned men that your Majesty may lawfully make all their children slaves; neither would your Majesty, in banishing all the Moors, do a thing that was never done by any of your ancestors; for they, in the year 1492, expelled all the Jews out of Spain, to the number of 24,000 families."

See Geddes' Tracts, vol. 1, p. 69.

In another memorial the same prelate says:—

"That if, as was notorious, on an information being taken, the Moors should be found guilty of being Mahometans, they might be condemned to lose all their goods, and to perpetual banishment out of the kingdom, within a prefixed period, which ought to be short. And though it is sufficient to engage your Majesty to rid Spain of all the Moors, only to let you know that you are bound in conscience, and under the pain of a mortal sin, to do it; nevertheless, since the expelling of them will be attended with great advantages, both spiritual and temporal, I cannot forbear laying some of them before your Majesty. Amongst these advantages are these, your Majesty, by selling all the children that are under seven years old, who are reckoned to be above 35,000, will both receive a good sum of money and will gain a great many subjects, who, being sold to old Christians, will all become Christians."

"Your Majesty may either send the strongest men to your own galleys or sell them. And on this occasion I will repeat, what I have often affirmed, that your Majesty may, without any scruple of conscience, make slaves of all the Moors, and may either put them into your own galleys and mines, or sell them to strangers; and whereas their number is very great, you may, after you have supplied your own galleys and mines, sell the rest of them in Italy."

And his last argument for their expulsion was:—

"The Moors being a laborious and industrious people, do, by working cheaper than the Spaniards are able to work, eat the bread out of the Spaniards' mouths, and being also very frugal and temperate, they do contribute little to the public exchequer."

These memorials of the archbishop were enforced and supported by the other prelates of Valencia, who, after a

* This has reference to the ancient interpretation of the name ISRAEL, viz, *and mens, videns Deum*. St. Jerome, though he disapproved of this etymology, allowed it to stand in his *Liber de Interpretatione nominum Hebraicorum*.

* The document will be found at length in vol. 1 of Geddes' Tracts, p. 39.

consultation, which lasted some months, came to a resolution which was privately presented to the king. That resolution was:—

"That the Moors of Valencia were all certainly apostates, and so obstinate, that there remained no hopes of their conversion."

This was in April, 1608, Geddes, vol. 1, p. 87.

These memorials and resolution were enforced by all the authority of the Primate of Spain. Their teaching was impressed on the King's mind by the Royal Confessor, and their effort was aided by the weakness and superstition of the royal conscience, which was instructed to believe that every portent of nature and every public miscarriage was sent to warn or punish him for the delay his own better feelings still interposed.

The Spanish priesthood at last prevailed. In 1609, notwithstanding the strong and earnest remonstrances of the Cortes of Arragon, the decree of expulsion was promulgated, and a whole people, remarkable only for their industry and manufacturing skill, for their quiet and peaceable demeanour, were at one blow deprived of their property, exiled from their pleasant homes, and driven forth, houseless wanderers, to perish in the deserts of Africa. And what did Spain gain? Her priests were no longer offended by the presence of a people who refused to listen to a religion that was forced on their attention by armed soldiers and by *autos da fe*. And the King of Spain became the sovereign of the most orthodox and the feeblest of the great monarchies of Europe.

THE DECRETAL EPISTLES.

No. 1.

THE POPES OF THE FIRST 400 YEARS, AND THE LETTERS THEY WROTE.

EVERYTHING which tends to throw light on the ancient Church of Rome is interesting alike to Protestants and Roman Catholics. Our readers, we are sure, would like to have a list of the early Popes, or Bishops of Rome, and the letters they wrote. We therefore give the list for 400 years. We give a column, showing the year in which each Pope succeeded the one before him; in the next column we state how many letters, said to be written by each Pope, we now have. It being acknowledged on all sides that some of those letters are *genuine* (that is, really written by the Popes whose names they go under), and it being also acknowledged on all sides that some of those letters are *forged* (that is, written by other people in after times, and passed off under those Popes' names, as if written by them), we give another column, showing which are forged, and which genuine. We shall afterwards show on what authority we pronounce some of them to be forgeries. We give also a column containing the references by which the letters themselves may be found in the Concilia Generalia of Labbe and Cossart.*

We do not give *as our own* the list of the Popes' names, and the years they succeeded each other; we give it as the list which Roman Catholics give for themselves. We take it from Vol. XVI. of Labbe and Cossart, p. 130. There are, no doubt, great difficulties about the list. Our readers will see in the list, that Liberius is counted the 37th Pope, and Damasus the 38th, and yet there is a Pope Felix between them! This is so in the list of Labbe and Cossart, which we copy exactly. The fact is, that Roman Catholics have never been able to agree whether this Felix were really a Pope or not. One party says he was; another party says he was not. It turns on an ugly question whether Pope Liberius were a heretic or not; and agreement about that can hardly be expected; because the proof of it is too strong to be got over by some,† and the inconvenience of it is too great to be admitted by others: so, to reconcile both parties, they put Felix's name in the list of Popes, and they do not count him in the number; and we, of course, adopt this arrangement. There is another difficulty, too, about Linus and Cletus, who stand second and third on the list. If (as Roman Catholics say) St. Peter was himself Pope of Rome until the day of his death; and if (as some of the early Fathers say) St. Peter himself, during his lifetime, ordained Clement as the first Bishop of Rome, it is not very easy to see how two other Popes could have come in between them. Protestants, who think that St. Peter was an Apostle to all the world, and not a Pope of Rome, may, perhaps, be able to solve this difficulty; but it is a difficulty to Roman Catholics. It is also a great question whether there ever were such a man as Cletus, who stands third on the list. Eusebius, the oldest ecclesiastical historian, says that Clement succeeded to Anacletus (Book III. chap. 15), and Evaristus to Clement (chap. 34), leaving no room for Cletus. And it is thought by some, that the name "Anacletus" has, by some accident, tumbled out of its proper place in the list, leaving a bit of itself behind to grow into another Pope.

There are also great difficulties about the dates at which some of the Popes succeeded. But we only mention these questions; we do not go into them; our chief business is with the letters said to have been written by the Popes; and

for this purpose we are content to take the list as Roman Catholics give it, and to leave the difficulties to them. So here follows the list:—

A TABLE OF THE EARLY POPES, AND THE LETTERS THEY WROTE.

No.	Names of the Popes.	Year in which each came to the See.	Number of letters written by each.	Whether Forged or Genuine.	Vol. and Col. in Labbe and Cossart, Conc. Gen.
1	St. Peter (as alleged by R. Catholics)	43	2 Epistles	Genuine	BIBLE
2	Linus ..	67	None		Vol. I.
3	Cletus ..	78	None		
4	Clement I. ..	91	5 to St. James & others	Genuine	122
5	Anacletus ..	101	3 Epistles	Forged	512
6	Evaristus ..	110	2 Epistles	Forged	533
7	Alexander I. ..	119	3 Epistles	Forged	542
8	Sixtus I. ..	130	3 Epistles	Forged	554
9	Telesphorus ..	140	1 Epistle	Forged	553
10	Hyginus ..	152	2 Epistles	Forged	566
11	Pius I. ..	155	4 Epistles	Forged	579
12	Anicetus ..	165	1 Epistle	Forged	580
13	Soter ..	173	2 Epistles	Forged	584
14	Eleutherus ..	177	1 Epistle	Forged	588
15	Victor I. ..	192	4 Epistles	Forged	592
16	Zephyrinus ..	201	2 Epistles	Forged	603
17	Callistus I. ..	219	2 Epistles	Forged	609
18	Urban I. ..	224	1 Epistle	Forged	618
19	Pontianus ..	231	2 Epistles	Forged	623
20	Anterus ..	235	1 Epistle	Forged	629
21	Fabian ..	236	3 Epistles	Forged	640
22	Cornelius ..	251	6 Epistles	3 Forged 3 Genuine	668
23	Lucius I. ..	253	1 Epistle	Forged	721
24	Stephen I. ..	255	2 Epistles	Forged	729
25	Sixtus II. ..	257	2 Epistles	Forged	820
26	Dionysius ..	258	2 Epistles	Forged	827
27	Felix I. ..	270	3 Epistles	Forged	904
28	Eutychian ..	275	2 Epistles	Forged	914
29	Caius ..	283	1 Epistle	Forged	925
30	Marcellinus ..	296	2 Epistles	Forged	932
31	Marcellus I. ..	304	2 Epistles	Forged	948
32	Eusebius ..	309	3 Epistles	Forged	1381
33	Melchisedes ..	311	1 Epistle	Forged	1395
34	Silvester I. ..	314	None		Vol. II.
35	Marcus ..	336	1 Epistle	Forged	470
36	Julius ..	336	4 Epistles	2 Forged 2 Genuine	475
37	Liberius ..	352	15 Epistles	3 Forged 10 Genuine	744
	Felix II. ..	366	2 Epistles	Forged	844
38	Damasus I. ..	367	10 Epistles	3 Genuine 2 Forged 2 Genuine	862
39	Siricius ..	385	5 Epistles	3 Genuine 2 Forged	1017
40	Anastasius ..	398	3 Epistles	1 Genuine	1191

On first looking down the column in which the word "forged" occurs so often, our readers may be tempted to think that we are only trifling with the subject, and with them, and telling stories too monstrous to be believed.

This, however, is not so; we are serious, and we speak truth.

All the letters entered in our list may be read in the places referred to.

All these letters, for 600 years at least, were universally believed to have been written by the Popes whose names they bear.

All these letters which we have marked as forgeries are now acknowledged (with hardly a single exception) by all learned Roman Catholics to be forgeries indeed, by which the world and the Church were imposed on for so long. No learned men among Roman Catholics will now venture to deny all this; and we have proof enough, if any one should attempt to deny it.

Now, look at the results of this Table.

We have ONE HUNDRED AND NINE letters of forty Popes, in 400 years. EIGHTY-FOUR of these are forgeries. Only TWENTY-FIVE are genuine: and if we take away the two Epistles which were written by St. Peter, whom we consider an Apostle, not a Pope, we have only TWENTY-THREE genuine, out of one hundred and seven.

In saying that twenty-three are genuine, we do not vouch for all these being genuine. Some we are sure are genuine; of some, the evidence is very little (if any) that they were really written by the Popes whose names they bear; of some we have little doubt that they, too, are forgeries. But those which are doubtful are of so little consequence, that it is not worth while to dispute about them; we are therefore content to admit them, for the present, as genuine, setting down as forged those only which we find to be acknowledged as forgeries by Roman Catholics themselves. Of all which we have set down as forgeries, there is ONLY ONE of which we have not Roman Catholic testimony that it is forged.

Who are our witnesses?

* As the last Pope here mentioned succeeded in 398, and died in 402, our list embraces four centuries.

The learned Du Pin, Doctor of the University of Paris, testifies for all in our list except one.

Labbe and Cossart, the two French Jesuits who collected the Councils, testify for all in one list, excepting about five* (and those mostly of the least consequence).

And in general, all learned men in the Church of Rome, for 250 years past, have admitted that nearly all those we call forgeries are really forgeries. Labbe and Cossart, vol. I. p. 78, name the following as making this admission:—Cardinals Baronius, Bellarmine, and Perron; Contius, Antonius Augustinus, Lorinus, Sirmond, Ducaens, Petavius, Marca, Bosquetus, and others, they say, too many to mention.

Devoti, Archbishop of Carthage, and Secretary to Pope Pius VII., is the latest Roman writer on Canon Law, having written in this present century, and he says, "All Catholic writers, excepting a few who would not take the trouble to examine carefully, have willingly confessed that they are forged." (Jus Canonicum, Preface, p. 4.)

That all these witnesses are not agreed about the precise numbers of the forgeries, may be easily understood. These witnesses lived at various times during the last 250 years. Three hundred years ago all Roman Catholics held that all these letters were true: when Protestants first began to question these letters, Roman Catholics cried out at them, that the arguments they were using would prove the Holy Scriptures themselves to be forgeries! But by degrees, as the arguments of Protestants got stronger, the Roman Catholics gave up one after another of the letters, when they found they could defend them no longer; so in each age more and more of these letters were confessed to be forgeries, until the learned Du Pin, who lived about 150 years ago, and who is one of the last who has published an accurate examination of all of them, fairly gave up every one in our list, except one.† And, therefore, we may hope that some candid Roman Catholic may yet be found to give up even this one too.

If any Roman Catholic now doubt the fairness of our list, and the statement we have made, we urge it on him to take this paper straight to his priest, and to call on the priest to shame us by exposing us in our own paper. And, according to our regular practice, we promise to insert anything that may be so sent to us.

Our readers are now perhaps ready to ask, What were all these letters forged for? and what are they all about?

An answer to the latter question, what these letters are about, will help to tell also what they were for.

Our readers may like to have the answer from a Roman Catholic; we take it from Severinus Binus, Archbishop of Cologne, in Germany, who published a collection of the Councils, about the year 1603.

He was one of the last of the learned men in the Church of Rome who made a vigorous effort to defend all these letters, when all others were giving them up as hopeless. We may therefore take his evidence as to what is in them: He says "most of those letters of the Popes were written about the Primacy of Peter; the dominion of the Roman Church; the ordination of Bishops; that priests are not to be injured nor accused, nor deposed; about appeals being made to the Apostolic See." There could not possibly be a truer or fairer statement of the general contents of these letters. A very few extracts may suffice for the present.

Anacletus in his first Epistle is made to say, "We confirm the laws of the Church by our Apostolical authority."‡ It is certainly odd that Pope Clement should not have done this already.

In his third Epistle, Anacletus is made to say, "This Holy and Apostolical Roman Church obtained the Primacy, and pre-eminence of power over all Churches, not from the Apostles, but from the Lord and Saviour himself."§

Pope Marcellus is made to say, "Charges of crime are not to be brought against priests, . . . for Christ is the head of the Church, and priests are the Vicars of Christ."|| Ep. 3. And Pope Fabian says, "The Apostles determined that they (priests) should not be accused; or, if this could not be otherwise accomplished, that the accusation of them should be made very difficult.—¶ Ep. 2. And Pope Julius is made to declare, "that all bishops, as often as they are attacked or accused in any more weighty causes, as often as may be necessary, may freely appeal to the Apostolic See, and fly to it as to their mother, that by it, as always was, they may be tenderly supported, defended and liberated."***

* Of some of these five it is very likely that Labbe and Cossart thought them forgeries too; but as they have not expressly said it, we do not say it on their authority.

† See Du Pin's Hist. of Eccl. Writers, Vol. I. p. 582, Ed. 1723, Dublin; and also under each Pope's name.

‡ Leges Ecclesie apostolica firmamus auctoritate.—Labbe & Coss. Vol. I. 518.

§ Hec vero sacrosancta Romana et apostolica Ecclesia, non ab apostolis, sed ab ipso Domino Salvatore nostro primum obtinuit, et eminentiam potestatis super universas Ecclesias.—Labbe & Coss. Vol. I. 524.

|| Criminaciones adversus Doctores non debere suscipi. Caput enim Ecclesie Christus est, Christi autem Vicarii Sacerdotes sunt.—Vol. I. p. 1389.

¶ Idecirco statuerunt, ne accusarentur; aut si aliter fieri non possit, per difficultates eorum fieret accusatio.—Vol. I. p. 643.

*** Ut omnes Episcopi qui in quibuscumque gravioribus pulsantur vel criminantur causis, quos necesse fuerit, libere apostolicum appellent sedem, atque ad eam quasi ad matrem confugiant, ut ab ea (sicut semper fuerit) pie fulciantur, defendantur et liberentur.—Labbe & Coss. Vol. II. p. 487.

* The edition of Labbe and Cossart referred to in the articles in this number is that published at Paris, 1672.

† The proof of Pope Liberius' heresy may be seen in this number, in our observations on the letter of "A Roman Catholic," page 142.